

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/687,785	687,785 10/17/2003		Gaurav Singh	RZMI-P308	9859	
32986	7590	01/27/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
IPSG, P.C.			PORTKA, GARY J			
P.O. BOX 7	00640					
SAN JOSE,	CA 951	70-0640	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
•				2188		

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				_
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/687,785	SINGH ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
		Gary J. Portka	2188	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	opears on the cover sheet with t	ne correspondence address	
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by staturely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply to divill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAND	TION. De timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 of This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) The Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters,	·	
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraware Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ ion Papers	awn from consideration.  for election requirement.		
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on <u>17 October 2003</u> is/ard Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	e: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ object of a displaying or accepted in abeyance. It is ction is required if the drawing (s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureacter the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Application or the contract of the contract	cation No eived in this National Stage	
2)  Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 r No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5)  Notice of Inform 6)  Other:		

Art Unit: 2188

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

#### Claim Objections

2. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities:

These claims recite coupling tables to a memory. However, a table is generally not a physical thing but rather a logical construct. Should the claims recite coupling the memory the tables are stored in to the second memory? This interpretation is used in determining whether prior art reads on this limitation. Appropriate correction or clarification is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 10 and 20 each recite that a table has a configurable width span across a space designated for at least two channels. The metes and bounds intended by this limitation are not clear. It is not clear what "space" is designated for a channel, or to what "space" refers. Since two channels could also share connections at different times, it is also not clear whether the claim covers a table of a single channel width, since the space would still be designated for two channels.

Art Unit: 2188

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 11-13, 15-16, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art.
- 7. As to claims 1, 11, and 21, the admitted prior art of Fig. 1 and paras. 2-3 disclose a configurable lookup table extension system as recited, comprising plurality of lookup tables arranged in a first memory (para. 3, "each of the internal tables"), second memory (e.g., MAC Table External Memory 112), and flexible controller configured to couple at least one table to the second memory through a single memory interface (e.g., External MAC Table Interface 108).
- 8. As to claims 2-3, 5-6, 8, 12-13, 15-16, and 18, the admitted prior art discloses the internal and external memory, SRAM and DRAM, IP and MAC types, MC, NHT, and LPM types, and plurality of data and address signals as recited.
- 9. Claims 1, 8, 11, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Melchior, US 6,473,846 B1.

Art Unit: 2188

10. As to claims 1, 8, 11, 18, and 21, Melchior discloses a configurable lookup table extension system as recited, comprising plurality of lookup tables arranged in a first memory (see Abstract, RAM 108 of Fig. 2, and col. 5 lines 50-55), second memory (memory of the CAM Engine 100, e.g., Output FIFO 136, Fig. 1), and flexible controller configured to couple at least one table to the second memory through a single memory interface (interface 124 and 128, Figs. 1 and 2).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 12. Claims 4, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art.
- 13. As to claim 4, the admitted prior art does not disclose that the first and second memories are both SRAM. However, it does disclose that the first memory is SRAM and the second is DRAM. An artisan would have been quite familiar with the advantages and shortcomings of each of these memory types, and would have known that having both memories as SRAM would increase the cost, but also increase the performance. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention thus would have been motivated by increased performance, if such was desired, to use SRAM for both memories.

Art Unit: 2188

14. As to claim 7, the admitted prior art discloses table configured for packet processing, and access queue coupling to the second memory (the interfaces of Fig. 1 would be required to be access "queues" unless out-of-order accesses are provided for, which is not disclosed). The admitted prior art also discloses the second memory may be DRAM, but does not disclose that the second memory has a plurality of banks. However, an artisan would have known that DRAM in general contains a plurality of banks, and thus would have expected that the access must couple to at least one bank as recited.

- 15. Claims 9-10 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, in view of Nataraj et al., US 6,757,779 B1.
- 16. As to claim 9, the admitted prior art does not disclose tables of the second memory having configurable width and depth. However, Nataraj has taught that this is beneficial to allow a CAM to store and maintain a different table size for each mode of operation (see Nataraj col. 22 lines 31-45). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a second memory with configurable width and depth, because this was known to allow a CAM to store different table sizes for each mode of operation as desired.
- 17. As to claim 10, the combination of the admitted prior art and Nataraj as described above would apparently have a configurable table span a space designated for at least two channels to the extent recited (also see 35 USC 112 rejection above).

Art Unit: 2188

#### Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Patent No:

6,732,184 Management of address table overflow.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary J. Portka whose telephone number is (571) 272-4211. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-4210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gary J Portka Primary Examiner Art Unit 2188

January 23, 2006

GARY PORTKA
PRIMARY EXAMINER